

REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 21, 2003, claims 1-19 were rejected as unpatentable as obvious over Graves (WIPO Publication WO 99/23601) in view of Haartzen (XP-000783249) which an Ericson AB technical bulletin regarding the Bluetooth network.

Graves, page 13, line 20, et seq., discloses a local system controller 204 which may be, for example, a personal computer which may link to a plurality of local system controllers 204, 2041 ... 204W, through local W networks 205, 205'. Each of the local system controllers 204 communicates with the individual currency discriminators 200a ... 200n and/or counters 202a ... 202n in its designated area (e.g., in a branch bank) to obtain information associated with no call documents, suspect documents and genuine currency evaluated by the individual currency discriminators and/or counters in the designated area. However, only monitoring operations occur, there is no control of the currency discriminators 200 by the local system controller 200. If a change is to be made in the operation of the currency discriminators, this is accomplished through other channels as described at page 12, line 22 through page 13, line 6, where it is described how the bank manager would read reports and then somehow, reset the sensitivity levels on the machines 200 (not through the network). Graves is a typical data acquisition system and it would not be suitable for cash settlement functions.

Haartzen describes the use of Bluetooth networks between computers and I/O devices and peripherals such as handheld units, cell phones, printers, access points to the Internet. There is not a suggestion in Haartzen that Bluetooth be used in more sophisticated commercial and industrial equipment having embedded controllers for controlling machine functions than are different from printing and keyboards which are the typical I/O functions of computers. The reason for this is that Bluetooth is a short range network. The conventional teaching for cash handling equipment is, as shown and described in Graves, to use a wired network to handle

equipment spread over larger areas. All of the items described in Haartzen are consumer devices, and are not embedded controller commercial and industrial equipment nor does Haartzen mention cash handling machines, contrary to the suggestion in the Office Action at the bottom of page 2.

Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the control unit performs two functions: 1) at least one of the operations of accounting for cash dispensing, cash settlement, and monitoring maintenance information and 2) providing commands for operation of the cash handling device. This second function distinguishes from Graves which is a monitoring or data acquisition system only.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the locally distributed network operates without intermediate servers and within an range of no more than approximately 100 meters. This distinguishes from wired networks as well as from long range wireless networks and other systems of the prior art as described below.

In addition, claim 5 adds wireless I/O devices to the system. The mouse, headset, cell phones, printers, and access points in Haartzen are basically I/O devices. If these devices are I/O devices then Haartzen does not suggest the use of the Bluetooth network between controller-based machines having functions beyond computing I/O functions. The only inter-computer connection in Haartzen is between two laptop computers. There are in fact, no machine controllers disclosed in Haartzen. This does not suggest that Haartzen could be substituted for the network in Graves, which is basically only a monitoring network and not a controlling network. Despite the use of the term controllers in Graves, no controlling functions in the machine sense are disclosed.

In addition, the Office action states that Haartzen discloses the IrDa network, but this is only in the context of declaring its unsuitability due to limited range (from one to two meters). Haartzen teaches away from use of IrDA. IrDA also has limitations due to line-of-sight requirements.

The other art cited in the Office action discloses the general availability of wireless networking systems, including remote displays, but does not suggest how to apply these systems to cash management in the financial industry.

An additional item of prior art is submitted herewith in which the currency monitoring device is a handheld unit. The handheld unit is interposed in the stream of communication between the cash handling machine and the controller unit and this would not provide direct communication path as claimed herein.


Traditionally, cash settlement has been carried out with personal computers and other stand-alone devices which have not been networked or have only been networked using conventional computer networks and conventional computer I/O devices such as printers.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendment and Remarks, reconsideration of the patent application is respectfully requested. After the amendment, claims 1-19 are still pending and a Notice of Allowance for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Michael J. McGovern  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497  
(414) 277-5725  
Attorney of Record